SUBJECT: ENTERPRISE RESOURCE PLANNING (ERP) SOFTWARE AS A SERVICE SOLUTION

BID #: ESC-0549-16 **OPEN DATE: 12/14/2016**

COMPETITIVE SEALED PROPOSAL EVALUATION COMMITTEE

KIND AND BASIS OF CONTRACT: Service Contract

AGENCY: Information Technologies Division

BASIS OF AWARD: Highest Scoring Bidder Based On Evaluation Criteria

NUMBER OF BIDS INVITED: (23) NUMBER RECEIVED: (8) OTHER: (1)

SUMMARY OF BIDS AND RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:
On December 14, 2016, the City of Jacksonville, Procurement Division received eight (8) valid bid responses for subject bid. On May 4, 2017 approval was granted for Software Demonstrations/ Oral Interviews with the top four (4) scoring vendors: (1) Applications Software Technology Corporation (AST), (2) IBM Corporation, (3) Infor Public Sector, Inc., and (4) CGI Technologies and Solutions, Inc. The evaluation of the responses and Software Demonstrations/ Oral Interviews has been completed and scored as follows:

VENDOR / SOFTWARE PRODUCT	RESPONSE EVALUATION SCORE	DEMONSTRATION SCORE	TOTAL SCORE
Applications Software Technology Corporation (AST) / Oracle	890	875	1765
IBM Corporation / Workday	775	841	1616
CGI Technologies and Solutions, Inc. / CGI Advantage 360	765	822	1587
Infor Public Sector, Inc. / Infor Public Sector, Inc.	725	826	1551

Recommend approval to move forward with contract negotiations with the highest scoring vendor, Applications Software Technology Corporation (AST).

ATTACHMENTS: Recommendation Memo; Scoring Sheet; Evaluation Matrix, Previous Award

BUYER: _____
CHELSEY FLEMING

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED _____
GREGORY PEASE, CHIEF
PROCUREMENT DIVISION

CONCURRENCE BY: **Marlene Russell, Director of Organizational Effectiveness**

(ALL AWARD ACTIONS SUBJECT TO LAWFULLY APPROPRIATED FUNDS)
ACTION OF CSPEC COMMITTEE ON RECOMMENDATIONS ABOVE

MEMBERS APPROVING _____ MEMBERS DISAPPROVING _____ DATE: _____

_____ _____ OTHER: _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

ACTION OF AWARDING AUTHORITY DATE _____

APPROVED _____ DISAPPROVED _____

OTHER _____

SIGNATURE OF AUTHENTICATION _____

City of Jacksonville, Florida

Lenny Curry, Mayor

City Hall at St. James
117 W. Duval St.
Jacksonville, FL 32202
(904) 630-CITY
www.coj.net

ONE CITY. ONE JACKSONVILLE.

October 20, 2017

TO: Gregory W. Pease, Chairman
Competitive Sealed Evaluation Committee

FROM: Marlene Russell
Director of Organizational Effectiveness

SUBJECT: ESC-0549-16 Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP)

The subcommittee received eight (8) proposals for evaluation for the subject project and found all to be responsive, interested, qualified and available to provide the services required by the RFP. The proposals were evaluated using the criteria outlined in RFP – ESC-0549-16. As outlined in the RFP, the City of Jacksonville developed a short list of the four highest scored responses and requested and received approval from this committee on May 4, 2017, to proceed with the software product demonstrations/oral interviews.

Those demonstrations were held with the following top 4 highest scored responders between June 6, 2017 and August 17, 2017.

Vendor	Software Product
AST	Oracle
CGI	CGI Advantage 360
IBM	Workday
Infor	Infor

At the conclusion of the demonstrations/oral interviews, the outcome is as follows with the vendors being listed alphabetically:

Ranking
(1) AST/Oracle
(3) CGI/CGI
(2) IBM/Workday
(4) Infor/Infor

We recommend that the above list be forwarded to the Mayor for final approval to proceed with fee and contract negotiations with the number one ranked firm AST/Oracle.

MR

Attachment: Scoring Matrix

Demo Scoring
ESC-0549-16
Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP)

Based on the combines scores of the response evaluation and software demonstrations, City will select the highest rated response

Vendor/Software	Response Evaluation Score	Demonstration Score	Total Score
AST/Oracle	890	875	1,765
IBM/Workday	775	841	1,616
CGI/CGI	765	822	1,587
Infor/Info	725	826	1,551

Sofware Demonstration Scores

Vendor	Software Product	Software Demonstration of Functional Business Areas - 300	Technical Presentation of SaaS System Solution/Support/ Product Updates - 200	Implementation Services Approach and Methodology - 300	Qualification and Experience of Proposed Personnel - 200	Total Points - 1,000
AST	Oracle	275	180	275	160	890
IBM	Workday	265	195	190	125	775
CGI	CGI	250	145	225	145	765
Infor	Infor	225	160	200	140	725

Evaluation Response Scores

Vendor - Prime	Software Product	Implementation Approach and Plan - 250	Software Solution - 300	Qualifications and Experience of Contractor(s) and Proposed Personnel - 50	SaaS Hosting Services - 200	Total Cost of Services, Solutions, and Rates - 200	Total Points - 1,000
AST	Oracle	245	270	50	189	121	875
IBM	Workday	225	263	40	185	128	841
Infor	Infor	225	273	48	180	100	826
CGI	CGI Advantage 360	225	260	40	184	113	822

(d) Price offerings shall be **inclusive of ALL costs** (including but not limited to administrative cost for submission of all required paperwork on Buyer's behalf and any other costs) and will be the only compensation given to Contractors for the required products and services herein.

(e) Failure to sign any form requiring a signature may be grounds for rejecting a Response. Where a signed form is required, electronic signature or scanned copy of signature shall be deemed an original signature.

2.4 Submission of Responses.

(a) The deadline for submitting Responses is set forth in Section 1.12 of this RFP. Contractors are fully responsible for meeting these requirements. **Late bids will not be considered.**

(b) Contractors must respond to this RFP as outlined in Attachment A and Attachment B of this RFP. Responses must be submitted electronically using the DecisionDirector application provided by Advantiv Solutions, LLC (DecisionDirector).

(c) The City will only accept Responses from Lead Contractors. Lead Contractors are responsible for obtaining access to DecisionDirector and then subsequently providing access to DecisionDirector to other Contractors as necessary and applicable in order to submit a complete Response.

(d) To obtain access to the Advantiv DecisionDirector application, Lead Contractors must contact (via email) the Buyer's Contact Person as identified in Section 1.14 of this RFP after the Pre-Bid meeting has been held. Lead Contractors will then receive specific instructions from the Buyer on how to gain access to DecisionDirector and specific instructions on how to use DecisionDirector to respond to this RFP. Lead Contractors must identify a single point of contact for their company to request access to DecisionDirector and, as necessary, to request any assistance in the use of DecisionDirector from Advantiv. Buyer will not respond to multiple requests for access to DecisionDirector from a single Contractor.

(e) Lead Contractors may provide a "hard" redacted copy of the Response as contemplated by Section 2.12 of this RFP. Such redacted copy must be received by Buyer before 5:00 p.m. Eastern on the fifth business day after Bid Opening. Buyer will use such hard copy only for the purposes of responding to public records requests and will evaluate Responses solely on the basis of the Responses submitted electronically using DecisionDirector.

(f) All references in this RFP to signatures, signing requirements or other required acknowledgements include electronic signature by means of clicking the "Submit Response" button (or other similar symbol or process) attached to or logically associated with the Response created by Contractor in DecisionDirector. Contractor agrees that the action of electronically submitting its Response constitutes: (1) an electronic signature on the Response, generally, (2) an electronic signature on any form or section specifically calling for a signature, and (3) an affirmative agreement to any statement contained in this RFP that requires a definite confirmation or acknowledgment.

(g) ADA Compliance Accommodation for DecisionDirector – In the event there is an ADA component that prevents a Lead Contractor from submitting a response via DecisionDirector, please contact the Contact Person identified in this RFP to assess facilitating the appropriate accommodation.

2.5 Evaluation of Responses.

(a) Buyer will determine the qualifications, interest and availability of Contractors by reviewing all Responses and, when deemed necessary in the sole discretion of Buyer, by conducting formal interviews of selected Contractors that are determined to be the best qualified based upon evaluation of the Responses.

(b) The determination of which Contractors are "best qualified" will be based upon the criteria set forth in this RFP.

(c) Buyer will employ the following process steps when evaluating which Contractors are "best qualified":

- Buyer will evaluate Responses using the evaluation criteria set forth in the following table and in **Attachment B**.

Response Evaluation Category	Maximum Score
Implementation Approach and Plan	250
Software Solution	300
Qualifications and Experience of Contractor(s) and Proposed Personnel	50
SaaS Hosting Services	200
Total Cost of Services, Solution, and Rates	200

- Based on the scoring of the Responses, Buyer will short-list no less than three but no more than 5 Responses for software demonstrations / oral interviews. If Buyer receives less than three responses to this RFP, Buyer reserves the right to proceed to demonstrations / oral interviews with the number of responses received at its sole discretion.
- Buyer will evaluate software demonstrations / oral interviews using the evaluation criteria set forth in the following table.

Software Demonstration / Oral Interview Evaluation Category	Maximum Score
Software Demonstration of Functional Business Areas	300
Technical Presentation of SaaS System Solution / Support / Product Updates	200
Implementation Services Approach and Methodology	300
Qualification and Experience of Proposed Personnel	200

Note: Should the City short-list Responses that contain the same software solution, the software solution will only be demonstrated once. The same evaluation scores for the Software Demonstration of Functional Business Areas and the Technical Presentation of SaaS Solution / Support / Product Updates (as listed in the above table) will be used for all short-listed Responses that contain that software solution.

- Based on the combined scores of the response evaluation and software demonstrations / oral interviews, Buyer will select the highest rated Response and begin contract negotiations with the Implementation Services Provider and the SaaS Solution Provider.
- If successful in negotiations, Buyer will move forward to award contracts per the guidelines outlined in Section 2.6.

(d) Before making an award, Buyer reserves the right to seek clarifications, revisions, and information it deems necessary for the proper evaluation of Responses. Failure to provide any requested clarifications, revisions or information may result in rejection of the Response.

(e) Buyer reserves the right to accept or reject any and all Responses, or separable portions thereof, and to waive any minor irregularity, technicality, or omission if Buyer determines that doing so will serve Buyer's best interests. Buyer may reject any Response not submitted in the manner specified by this RFP.

SUBJECT: ENTERPRISE RESOURCE PLANNING (ERP) SOFTWARE AS A SERVICE SOLUTION

BID #: ESC-0549-16 **OPEN DATE: 12/14/2016**

COMPETITIVE SEALED PROPOSAL EVALUATION COMMITTEE

KIND AND BASIS OF CONTRACT: Service Contract

AGENCY: Information Technologies Division

BASIS OF AWARD: Highest Scoring Bidder Based On Evaluation Criteria

NUMBER OF BIDS INVITED: (23) NUMBER RECEIVED: (8) OTHER: (1)

SUMMARY OF BIDS AND RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:
On December 14, 2016, the City of Jacksonville, Procurement Division received eight (8) responses for subject bid. The Evaluation Committee has completed their review and has recommend approval to move forward with Software Demonstrations/ Oral Interviews with the top four (4) scoring vendors, which are as follows. The ranking of first, second, third and fourth designates the order of qualification of these firms.

1. Applications Software Technology Corporation (AST)
2. IBM Corporation
3. Infor Public Sector, Inc.
4. CGI Technologies and Solutions, Inc.

ATTACHMENTS: Recommendation Memo; Scoring Sheet; Evaluation Matrix

BUYER _____ CHELSEY RENFROE

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED _____ GREGORY PEASE, CHIEF PROCUREMENT DIVISION

CONCURRENCE BY: **Marlene Russell, Director of Organizational Effectiveness**

(ALL AWARD ACTIONS SUBJECT TO LAWFULLY APPROPRIATED FUNDS)
ACTION OF CSPEC COMMITTEE ON RECOMMENDATIONS ABOVE

MEMBERS APPROVING 5 MEMBERS DISAPPROVING Ø DATE: 5/04/17

Marlene Russell _____ OTHER: _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

ACTION OF AWARDING AUTHORITY DATE 5/04/17

APPROVED _____ DISAPPROVED _____

OTHER _____

SIGNATURE OF AUTHENTICATION _____

Sam E. Mousa
Chief Administrative Officer
For: Mayor Lenny Curry
Under Authority of:
Executive Order No. 2015-05